

Docket No.: FICHTNER
Appl. No.: 10/789,411

REMARKS

The last Office Action of March 8, 2005 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 9, 12, and 13 have been amended. Claims 14 and 15 have been added. No claim has been canceled. An amendment to the specification has been made. No fee is due.

It is noted that claims 4, 9, and 12 are objected to because of some informalities.

It is further noted that claims 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by German Pat. No. DE 19525704 C1 to Jensen et al..

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 2,003,587 to Fahlmann.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 2,499,390 to Joy.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jensen.

It is noted with appreciation that claims 4-12 are indicated allowable if rewritten in independent form to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112,

Docket No.: FICHTNER
Appl. No.: 10/789,411

2nd paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. It is also noted with appreciation that claim 13 is indicated allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has rewritten claim 4 in independent form, as suggested by the Examiner, who indicated that originally filed claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In drafting claim 4, applicant has taken great care to address the objection and rejection under 112, 2nd paragraph, raised by the Examiner. It is believed that claim 4 is now in condition for allowance. In addition, applicant has rewritten claim 13 in independent claim, as suggested by the Examiner, who indicated that originally filed claim 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 13 is thus also believed in condition for allowance. Claims 9 and 12 have been amended, as suggested by the Examiner, to also address the objection and rejection under 112, 2nd paragraph.

In order to clearly distinguish claim 1 from the applied prior art, applicant has amended claim 1 by setting forth the particular configuration of the plate. More specifically, claim 1 now sets forth the planar outer surface of the plate and the extension of the plate to the area of the shaft. In addition, applicant has added a new claim 14 to set forth the formation of a recess, as shown, e.g., in Fig. 10 and labeled with reference numeral "23". Claim 15 has been added to set forth the radial extension of the plate in relationship to the shaft.

The Jensen reference describes an encapsulated rotor having a shaft and laminated rotor core mounted thereon. Secured on opposite ends of the rotor

Docket No.: FICHTNER
Appl. No.: 10/789,411

core are end plates. As shown in the drawing, the end plates have a cup-shaped configuration (see also col. 3, lines 52-58). Thus, Jensen fails to disclose the provision of a plate with planar outer surface which extends to the shaft.

The Fahlman reference describes a rotor having a shaft and laminated rotor core mounted thereon. As stated on page 2, left column, lines 2 to 5, "*End rings 4 formed of aluminum or aluminum alloy are also cast around the peripheral margin of the end laminations*" [emphasis added]. As further emphasized on page 2, right col., lines 62-64, the end rings 4 are formed by flowing molten metal into the lower end ring cavities. Thus, the end rings are an integral part of the rotor core. Fahlman fails to disclose a separate plate having a rotor core distal planar outer surface and extending to an area of the shaft to allow axial deflection of the rotor laminations in the area of the plate.

The Joy reference describes a rotor having a shaft and laminated rotor core mounted thereon. Disposed at each end of the rotor core are end plates which are configured to fit about the protruding ends of conductor bars (see, col. 3, lines 27-31, and Fig. 1). Thus Joy fails to the provision of a plate with planar outer surface which extends to the shaft.

For the reasons set forth above, it is applicant's contention that neither Jensen, nor Fahlman, nor Joy, nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests the features of the present invention, as recited in claim 1.

Claim 2, 3, 14, and 15 which depend from claim 1 and therefore contain all the limitations thereof, patentably distinguishes over the applied prior art in the same manner as claim 1.

Docket No.: FICHTNER
Appl. No.: 10/789,411

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §§102(b) and 103(a) and allowance of claims 1-3, 14, 15 are thus also respectfully requested.

CLARIFICATION AMENDMENT

Applicant has amended the instant specification to provide consistency throughout the specification. This change is self-explanatory and does not contain any new matter.

CITED REFERENCES

Applicant has also carefully scrutinized the further cited prior art and finds it without any relevance to the newly submitted claims. It is thus felt that no specific discussion thereof is necessary.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that when reconsidering the claims in the light of the above comments, the Examiner will agree that the invention is in no way properly met or anticipated or even suggested by any of the references however they are considered.

None of the cited references discloses, alone or in combination, an electric machine with a combination of claim elements, as set forth in claim 1, in

Docket No.: FICHTNER
Appl. No.: 10/789,411

particular the provision of a separate plate having a rotor core distal planar outer surface and extending to an area of the shaft to allow axial deflection of the rotor laminations in the area of the plate.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Henry M. Feiereisen
Agent For Applicant
Reg. No: 31,084

Date: June 3, 2005
350 Fifth Avenue
Suite 4714
New York, N.Y. 10118
(212)244-5500
HMF:ub